REMARKS

Claims 17, 19-26, 28-34, 36-41, and 43-52 are pending in this application, with claims 17, 32, 47, and 50 being independent. Claims 1-16, 27 and 42 were previously canceled, and claims 18 and 35 have been canceled herein. Claims 17, 19-21, 24, 28, 31-34, 36, 39, 43, 46-48, 50, and 51 have been amended. No new subject matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

Claims 17, 18, 20, 26, 32, 33, 35, 41, 46 and 50 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell, *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,526,407, hereinafter "Russell"), in view of Yamamoto, *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,355,338, hereinafter "Yamamoto"); claims 19, 21-25, 28-31, 34, 36-40, 43-45, 47-49, 51 and 52 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell and Yamamoto in view of other prior art. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 17, which has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 18 as previously presented, recites, "producing an index table by sequentially reading the information data blocks and the signal pause data blocks." The Office Action states that "Russell further disclosed producing an index table by sequentially reading the information data blocks and the signal pause data blocks." (Office Action, page 6.) The Examiner bases this conclusion on col. 14, lines 43 to 67 and col. 11, lines 1 to 17 of Russell. Applicant respectfully submits that this limitation is not taught by Russell and Yamamoto.

In col. 10, line 59 to col. 11, line 27 Russell discusses that data structures within personal computer 27 are shown in FIG. 5. These data structures are used to categorize and to manage the speech information.

FIG. 5 shows a hierarchy of tables. The tables are connected by pointers. The data structure tables shown in FIG. 5 serve to categorize or "tag" the speech information. At the top of the FIG. 5 are the "Property Classes" (tables 71A, 71B) which can be applied to the speech. Examples of the properties include who is speaking, that an item of voice mail is to be created with that speech, or that the speech is included in some filing category. In the middle of FIG. 5 are "Property Tables" (tables 73A, 73B, 73C) which establish the actual relation between the speech and the properties. "Tag Tables" (tables 75A, 75B) are used to list the properties describing a certain interval of speech. The contents of each Tag Table (75A or 75B) define the beginning and the end times defined by that Tag Table and include a list of the names of additional tables which further categorize the speech. Each such name is referred to as a "Tag." As indicated earlier, each name refers to a "Property Table" (indicated as 73A or 73B or 73C in FIG. 5). A Property Table consists of the actual data which describes the speech, a pointer to the property class (71A or 71B) which contains computer programs for interpreting and manipulating data, and a list of the Tag Tables (75A, 75B) which refer to this particular Property Table (73A or 73B or 73C).

Fig. 5 of Russell, and its corresponding description discloses data structure tables, forming a hierarchy of tables, the tables connected between each other by pointers, the tables being one of tables indicative of "property classes," tables indicative "property tables," and tables indicative of "tag tables." Russell, however, does not teach or suggest an index table, and therefore, does not teach or suggest producing an index table by sequentially reading the information data blocks and the signal pause data blocks.

The Examiner also relies on disclosure made in Russell in col. 14, lines 43 to col. 15, line 3, again as anticipatory for above mentioned limitations of claim 17. We disagree with the

Examiner regarding this assessment as well, and refer to the applied portion of the reference that discloses regarding the speech process part 137 that speech flows from the sound pickup unit 123 into a buffer 125, and further to a temporary file 143, and ultimately to a permanent file 145. This flow is managed by a speech process program 136. The speech process program 136 allocates buffers to receive the real-time speech, examines the directional cues received from the sound pickup unit 123, utilizes the cues to separate the speech into phrases demarcated by perceptible pauses or changes in who is speaking, creates a temporary file 143 containing the speech marked with the phrase demarcations, and sends and receives messages from the user interface part 139 through the communication method 141. In response to messages received from the user interface part 139, the speech process part 137 may store the speech and phrase information stored in the temporary file 143 in the permanent storage 145, delete speech and phrase information from the temporary file 143, or permanent storage 145, or direct speech information to another application, or allow speech to be re-constructed and played through the replay facilities 147 that are linked to the soundboard 133. Separately, the speech process program 145 may further process the stored speech and cues to further identify speech attributes such as particular words or points of emphasis, to improve the phrase identification, or to compress the speech. Results of this further processing may also be stored in the temporary file 143 and permanent file 145 and the derived speech attributes sent to the user interface part 149 again using the communication method 141.

Applicant notes that it is clearly stated in Russell that the results of this processing are stored in a temporary file 143 or a permanent file 145. Russell, however, does not state that an index table is produced. Furthermore, Yamamoto does not teach or suggest these limitations. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that claim 17 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Claims 19-26, and 28-31 depend from claim 17 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Claim 32 has been amended to recite, "producing an index table by sequentially reading the information data blocks and the signal pause data blocks." As is discussed hereinabove with respect to claim 17, the prior art of record does not teach or suggest this limitation. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that claim 32 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Claims 33, 34, 36-41 and 43-46 depend from claim 32 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Claim 47 has been amended to recite, "producing an index table by sequentially reading the information data blocks and the signal pause data blocks." As is discussed hereinabove with respect to claim 17, the prior art of record does not teach or suggest this limitation. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that claim 47 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Claims 48 and 49 depend from claim 47 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Claim 50 has been amended to recite:

> a data processor configured to read sequentially the stored data blocks and the signal pause data block, and store a start address and an end address of a succession of information data blocks which is not interrupted by a signal pause with a first predetermined duration in an index table in the memory.

As is discussed with respect to claim 17 hereinabove, the prior art of record does not teach or suggest producing an index table by sequentially reading the information data blocks and the

signal pause data blocks. The prior art, therefore, cannot teach or suggest a data processor configured to read sequentially the stored data blocks and the signal pause data block, and store the start address and end address of a succession of information data blocks which is not interrupted by a signal pause with a first predetermined duration in an index table in the memory. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that claim 50 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Claims 51 and 52 depend from claim 50 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Applicant has made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Benjamin E. Nise, Applicant's Attorney, at 972-732-1001 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that are due, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

Respectfully submitted,

_7/19/2010_
Date

_____
Benjamin E. Nise
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 55,500

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas 75252
Tel.: 972-732-1001
Fax: 972-732-9218